

**To:** Tiffany Waters[twaters@nwifc.org]  
**From:** Chang, Lisa  
**Sent:** Wed 12/18/2013 10:55:43 PM  
**Subject:** RE: Delay in Swinomish proposal review

Thanks, Tiffany. That is a great point (limited to State lobbying) that was critical when the attorneys reviewed it the first time. I don't really know what the issue is this time – someone else raised it – and we are meeting with someone from our legal staff this afternoon and I will hopefully learn more that I can pass along. I'll specifically ask about the distinction between State and Federal lobbying.

**From:** Tiffany Waters [mailto:twaters@nwifc.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 18, 2013 1:28 PM  
**To:** Chang, Lisa  
**Subject:** RE: Delay in Swinomish proposal review

Thanks, Lisa. I figured that this particular review might take a bit longer than usual. Let's definitely talk more about this once your attorneys have had a chance to look at it. From our perspective, Swinomish's work up until this point has been concentrated on education and outreach, not 'lobbying.'

This stated though and in looking forward, in reviewing the anti-lobbying clause and associated certificate that we and our tribes have to sign, I was under the impression that it referred only to a prohibition of the use of EPA funds in lobbying representatives of the *federal* government, not representatives of the State of Washington. Additionally, an integral part of the Action Agenda is to "Improve, strengthen, and streamline implementation and enforcement of laws, plans, regulations, and permits consistent with protection and recovery targets" (A.1.3).

Once they've had a chance to review the proposal further, let's set a time to talk about this in January.

Thanks!

Tiffany

Tiffany Waters

Puget Sound Recovery Projects Coordinator

6730 Martin Way E., Olympia, WA 98516

(p) 360.528.4318

**From:** Chang, Lisa [mailto:[Chang.Lisa@epa.gov](mailto:Chang.Lisa@epa.gov)]

**Sent:** Wednesday, December 18, 2013 12:29 PM

**To:** Tiffany Waters

**Subject:** Delay in Swinomish proposal review

Hi Tiffany,

Thanks for coming up yesterday; Michael and I felt it was really helpful to meet with you and Steve in person.

I apologize about the delay in reviewing the Suquamish and Swinomish proposals. I should have Suquamish to you by the end of the week. However, Swinomish will probably take a bit longer.

We kind of alluded to this tangentially during yesterday's talk. Way back when (see old e-mails below), a reviewer had raised a question about whether the activities in the Swinomish proposal verged on lobbying, which can't be funded under our funding. At that time, it turned out to be okay, but this time around, since the proposal talks directly about supporting a ballot initiative, the attorneys want to take a bit of a closer look at it. We may not be able to resolve this before the holidays, so I apologize, but I think their input will help make sure the grant stays solidly within grant regs.

Again, I am sorry about this delay. I'll try to keep you updated as quickly as I can.

Lisa

----- Forwarded by Lisa Chang/R10/USEPA/US on 12/18/2013 12:19 PM -----

From: Lisa Chang/R10/USEPA/US  
To: Tiffany Waters <[twaters@nwifc.org](mailto:twaters@nwifc.org)>,  
Date: 02/24/2012 09:24 AM  
Subject: RE: Stilla QAPP sig page

---

Oh dear - I am sorry I overlooked that. Maja brought it to my desk yesterday afternoon, so I am assuming she signed it yesterday. So if you do not mind, is it possible for you to just hand-write in 2/23? These bureaucratic processes can be very aggravating until one has a fail-safe process nailed down.

I think I should have the Swinomish comments back to you today - I am sorry they took longer than I planned, but we actually had to confer with headquarters attorneys about lobbying provisions in our grants regulations, since the proposal seeks to directly influence legislation and decision-makers. The good news is, we do not believe the proposed crosses the line on lobbying restrictions, although we may suggest some tweaks to minimize the possibility that the work would be misperceived as lobbying.

On the Muckleshoot proposal, the reviewer sent me comments but asked to meet with me to discuss the comments, and I have unfortunately not been able to connect with her because of our schedules.

On the Nisqually proposals, two key reviewers I have selected have been out all week, but I am going to aim to get your comments on those next week.

▼ Tiffany Waters ---02/24/2012 09:08:01 AM---Hey Lisa, that's it's no problem at all. I've signed it and am now integrating it into the full QAPP

From: Tiffany Waters <[twaters@nwifc.org](mailto:twaters@nwifc.org)>  
To: Lisa Chang/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 02/24/2012 09:08 AM  
Subject: RE: Stilla QAPP sig page

---

Hey Lisa, that's it's no problem at all. I've signed it and am now integrating it into the full QAPP now. One quick question: I'm seeing that Maja didn't date her signature, is that something that is absolutely necessary or is it fine as is?

Thanks!  
Tiffany

-----Original Message-----

From: Lisa Chang [<mailto:Chang.Lisa@epamail.epa.gov>]  
Sent: Friday, February 24, 2012 8:46 AM  
To: [twaters@nwifc.org](mailto:twaters@nwifc.org)  
Subject: Fw: Stilla QAPP sig page

Hi Tiffany,

Here is the Stillaguamish QAPP signature page with EPA signatures.  
Again, I am sorry about the backward "flow" on this one. Thank you for  
turning this around.

Lisa

----- Forwarded by Lisa Chang/R10/USEPA/US on 02/24/2012 08:44 AM -----

From: Lisa Chang/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
To: Lisa Chang/R10/USEPA/US@EPA  
Date: 02/24/2012 08:44 AM  
Subject: Stilla QAPP sig page

(See attached file: Stilla QAPP sig page.pdf)